

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:
MAGNA INTERNATIONAL INC. ET AL
337 Magna Drive
AURORA, Ontario
Canada, L4G 7K1

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (date/month/year) 24 January 2005 (24-01-2005)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
20826/309534

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application no
PCT/IB2004/002528

International filing date (date/month/year))
06 August 2004 (06-08-2004)

Priority date (date/month/year)
12 August 2003 (12-08-2003)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC7 B23K 26/20, B23K 26/16, B23K 26/32

DUE DATE:

March 12/05

Applicant **MAGNA INTERNATIONAL INC. ET AL**

ACTION:

*Resp for w/o.
@ Demand dd.*

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items :

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(I) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/
Commissioner of Patents
Canadian Patent Office
Box PCT, Ottawa/Gatineau K1A 0C9

Authorized officer

Hoan Huynh (819) 934-3467

Facsimile No. (819) 953-9538

Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/002528

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

- ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language __, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments :

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/002528

Box No. V reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(I) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	3	YES
	Claims	1-2	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	3	YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-3	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations :

Reference is made to the following document:

D1: WO 90/11161 (Behler et al.) 04 October 1990

1. Document D1 disclosed an arrangement for laser lap welding of galvanized steel workpieces wherein at least one workpiece has a shaping in the region on one of the surface of the steel sheet which keeps adjacent surfaces at a distance apart. The arrangement is designed so that the shaping is in the form of a straight knurl, a milling, or a series of indentations which can be produce by cold pressing, rolling, or stamping. All essential features of the method in Claims 1-2 are disclosed by D1. Claims 1-2 do not satisfy the criterion set forth in Article 33(2) PCT because the subject matter of the claims is not new in respect of D1.

2. Claim 3 is inventive, prior arts failed to teach an arrangement method wherein a raised region is comprising a plurality of fine particles applied between the coated metal sheets.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/002528

Box No. VIII Certain observations in the international application

The following observation on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawing or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made :

1. The claims do not comply with Rule 6.3 (b) of the Regulations Under the PCT. The claims shall be placed in the two part form with a statement of the necessary technical features of the invention which are required for definition of the subject matter and a characterizing portion which states the technical features for which protection is desired.
2. The claims do not comply with Rule 6.2 (b) of the Regulations Under the PCT. Each technical feature of the claims shall be followed by the drawing reference character to which it corresponds. The drawing reference characters shall be placed in parentheses.
3. Claim 1 does not comply with Rule 6.1 (a) of the Regulations Under the PCT. The claim must be clear and concise. The term "embossment" lacks antecedent and is not definitive.
4. The description does not comply with Rule 5.1 (ii) of the Regulations Under the PCT. The relevant background art, such as that cited here, must be discussed in the description to aid in the understanding, examining and searching of this application.
5. A statement in the description, such as found on page 1 which incorporates by reference any other document, does not comply with Rule 5.1 (ii) of the Regulations Under the PCT.